



1258292 - R8 SDMS

Re: Fw: OU-1 cleanup work
Sonya Pennock to: Carol Campbell

06/21/2010 11:01 AM

I don't think we should respond to email strings that appear to be conversations among this group. Here is a draft of tips I'm developng for dealing with unreasonable complainants. Also, I'm asking one of my SEEs to develop a "library" of our responses to these folks so that we can tell what we have responded to and what not. I'm meeting with Bill on Thursday to see if we can come up with yet another means of managing them. My initial suggestions:

Ask them to provide us with one clear synthesis of their questions in writing.

Make it clear we will not respond to personal attacks and rude language.

Make clear that while we are in the process of responding to their questions, we will not entertain new questions or complaints.

Insist that all communications be via letter--not email.

All document requests made through FOIA in writing

Identify a single point of contact for them. Don't know who that will be--they hate Ted, me and you.

Make clear we will not respond to email strings such as the below.

Where we have already responded, make clear that this is our final word on the subject and we will not respond further.

Here is a very draft copy of my initial suggestions for dealing with unreasonable complainants. You will see that it calls for us to develop a policy for handling complaints which I don't believe we have at this point.



Unreasonable Complainants.general suggestions..doc

Sonya Pennock
Office of Communications & Public Involvement
US/EPA Region 8
1595 Wynkoop Street
Denver, CO 80202-1129
Phone: 303-312-6600

Carol Campbell | more stuff to contemplate and reanswer or come... | 06/21/2010 10:51:52 AM

From: Carol Campbell/R8/USEPA/US
To: Victor Ketellapper/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Sonya Pennock/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Steve Wharton/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Bill Murray/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Martin Hestmark/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 06/21/2010 10:51 AM
Subject: Fw: OU-1 cleanup work

more stuff to contemplate and reanswer or come up with new answers

Carol L. Campbell, Assistant Regional Administrator
United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8
1595 Wynkoop Street
Denver, Colorado
80202

303-312-6340 (W)
303-312-6071(fax)

----- Forwarded by Carol Campbell/R8/USEPA/US on 06/21/2010 10:50 AM -----

From: gordon sullivan <gordsull@yahoo.com>
To: DC Orr <xcav8orr@hotmail.com>, Mike Cirian/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Michelle Hartly <michelle@filmwestllc.com>, Carol Campbell/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, FilmWest <filmwest@gmail.com>
Cc: Andy Lensink/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Bill Murray/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, brad@libbyasbestos.org, catharine_ransom@baucus.senate.gov, clecours@mt.gov, suzi rios <five_rivers@ymail.com>, Freya Margand/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Helen Dawson/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, jpodolinsky@mt.gov, Kirby Campbell-Rierson <kirby_campbell-rierson@baucus.senate.gov>, larry.anderson@mail.house.gov, Lawrence Grandison/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, mvolesky@mt.gov, Rebecca Thomas/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, rodriguez-newstroml@cdm.com, Sean Earle/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Ted Linnert/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Terry Spear <tspear@mtech.edu>, Victor Ketellapper/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Virginia Sloan <virginia_sloan@tester.senate.gov>, jim.hammons@cityoflibby.com, glena.young@cityoflibby.com
Date: 06/21/2010 09:24 AM
Subject: Re: OU-1 cleanup work

Michelle,

Do you or anyone you know have contacts in Fox News, or CNN??
Gordon Sullivan

--- On Fri, 6/18/10, FilmWest <filmwest@gmail.com> wrote:

From: FilmWest <filmwest@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: OU-1 cleanup work
To: "gordon sullivan" <gordsull@yahoo.com>, "DC Orr" <xcav8orr@hotmail.com>, Cirian.Mike@epamail.com, Campbell.Carol@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: Lensink.Andy@epamail.epa.gov, Murray.Bill@epamail.epa.gov, brad@libbyasbestos.org, catharine_rar <five_rivers@ymail.com>, Margand.Freya@epamail.epa.gov, Dawson.Helen@epamail.epa.gov, jpodolinsk <kirby_campbell-rierson@baucus.senate.gov>, larry.anderson@mail.house.gov, Grandison.Lawrence@epamail.epa.gov, rodriguez-newstroml@cdm.com, Earle.Sean@epamail.epa.gov, Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov, "Terry Spear Sloan" <virginia_sloan@tester.senate.gov>, jim.hammons@cityoflibby.com, glena.young@cityoflibby.com
Date: Friday, June 18, 2010, 8:11 AM

Poor Ted . He's apparently drunk on his power and thinks he's a Jedi Master.

On 6/15/10 8:24 AM, "gordon sullivan" <gordsull@yahoo.com> wrote:

Ted Linnert has rapidly misrepresented the truth such as the time he ensured the Libby the W.R. Grace settlement funds. This among other representations was the reason the challenged on his comments, which were on tape, the man said " I didn't say that." Even but learned quickly never to trust a word he says. His word-smithing of important information cause real problems for the cleanup and the people involved. Here's a man who actual comments about the performance of CAG, which ended up causing a split which has 1

whole "social marketing strategy" should be the topic of federal investigation. You sh
If you need the source of Mr. Linnert's work in Libby it is all a matter of record!!!!
Good Luck
Gordon Sullivan

--- On Tue, 6/15/10, Michelle Hartly <michelle@filmwestllc.com> wrote:

From: Michelle Hartly <michelle@filmwestllc.com>

Subject: Re: OU-1 cleanup work

To: "gordon sullivan" <gordsull@yahoo.com>, "DC Orr" <xcav8orr@hotmail.com>

Cc: Lensink.Andy@epamail.epa.gov, Murray.Bill@epamail.epa.gov, brad@lib

clecours@mt.gov, "suzi rios" <five_rivers@ymail.com>, Margand.Freya@epa

jpodolinsky@mt.gov, "Kirby Campbell-Rierson" <kirby_campbell-rierson@ba

Grandison.Lawrence@epamail.epa.gov, mvolesky@mt.gov, Thomas.Rebecca@

Earle.Sea@epamail.epa.gov, Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov, "Terry Spear" <t

"Virginia Sloan" <virginia_sloan@tester.senate.gov>, jim.hammons@cityoflib

Date: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 12:51 AM

Is this CIC (LINNERT) really still collecting money from US taxpayers? Can s

Someone may want to inform him of the facts, which he consistently misrepres

1. Re; "encouraging air samples" ---

See data from EPA report <http://www.epa.gov/libby/AmbientAirReportFinal0>
(HAS ANYONE READ THE EPA REPORT DATED 2/09/2009 ? OR ANY(C

Risk calculations based on mean outdoor ambient air concentrations, rather than
consequence of the lack of a method for calculating the 95th UCL, **this uncerta**

Uncertainty in the Cancer Exposure-Response Relationship

The method currently recommended for evaluating cancer risk from inhalation
limitations, as follows:

- The unit risk values reported by USEPA (1986) and used by USEPA (2008) a

without any distinction to mineral type (chrysotile, amphibole). However, there is an important determinant of potency, with amphibole tending to be somewhat more potent than chrysotile (Hodgson and Darnton 2000). To the extent that amphibole is more potent than chrysotile, the risks in Libby, where the mineral form of concern is amphibole.

- The unit risk values are based on observations of cancer occurrence in worker populations susceptible to asbestos or episodic exposures.

- The unit risk values represent the central tendency estimates of the potency factors. They are important, because exposure estimates provided in the epidemiological reports are often highly uncertain, and hence the true unit risk values might be different.

An additional concern is that the cancer unit risks derived by USEPA (1986) are based on data from the 1970's. Thus, they may not be applicable to populations that are exposed to asbestos today.

In particular, as life expectancy has increased, the risk of developing cancer from an exposure to asbestos has also tended to increase.

Thus, cancer risk predictions based on the current method may tend to be conservative.

2) ER VS HOMEOWNER.

ER WAS NOT PRESENT WHEN SUZANNE RIOS PURCHASED HER HOME. IS IT THE EPA'S POSITION THAT IT IS APPROPRIATE TO OPERATE A SCHOOL ZONE, RESIDENTIAL AREA NEXT TO CHILDREN>?????

3) RE: BUYOUT

THE CIC IS MISINFORMED AND NOW MISREPRESENTS FEDERAL POLICY GUIDELINES.

CAN SOMEONE ANSWER THE QUESTION AS POSED?

THANK YOU,

MICHELLE HARTLY

On 6/14/10 4:52 PM, "five_rivers@ymail.com" <five_rivers@ymail.com> wrote

>

> Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov

> Date: Mon, 14 Jun 2010 14:15:31

> To: <five_rivers@ymail.com>

> Cc: <Ketellapper.Victor@epamail.epa.gov>; <Lensink.Andy@epamail.epa.gov>

> <Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov>; <Faulk.Libby@epamail.epa.gov>;

> <Pennock.Sonya@epamail.epa.gov>; <emack@lockelord.com>

> Subject: 188 Mahoney Road

>

>

> Hello Ms. Rios,

>

> Thank you for the message that appears below. EPA is not "buying out"

> any property in Libby and does not even have the authority to do so.

> For the record, ER began leasing the property next to your house in

> 2002, which is before you moved into the neighborhood. You moved in

> next to ER, not the other way around. According to the Libby Area

> Chamber of Commerce, the local real estate market is relatively strong

> so you should be able to sell your house without difficulty.

>

> EPA began its first round of the current ambient air sampling program in

> 2007. The third round of ambient air sampling began last May. All

> rounds of this sampling effort included a monitor in ER's equipment

> yard. As you can see below, the results are very encouraging:

>

> Date of Sampling Ambient Air

> Concentration

>

>

Pre- 1990, City Center 0.59 s/cc

>

> 2002 Lincoln County 0.00010 to
> Courthouse Annex 0.00086 s/cc
>
> 2008 Average OU4 0.0000056 s/cc
> Monitoring stations
>
> Ted Linnert
> Office of Communication & Public Involvement
>
> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8 - OC
> 1595 Wynkoop Street
> Denver, CO 80202-1129
>
> (303) 312-6119 / fax (303) 312-7110
> toll free: 1-800-227-8917 x6119
> linnert.ted@epa.gov
>
>
>
> From: five_rivers@ymail.com
>
> To: Victor Ketellapper/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Mike Cirian/R8/USEPA
> filmwest@gmail.com, "DC Orr"
> <xcav8orr@hotmail.com>, "Catherine Ransom"
> <catharine_ransom@baucus.senate.gov>, "Gordon Sullivan"
> <gordsull@yahoo.com>
>
> Date: 06/08/2010 11:07 PM
>
> Subject: Re:
>
>
>
>
>
> EPA/ER continue their status quo clean up activities. As a land owner
> who has lost confidence in EPA/ER's decision making and inept
> leadership, I request to be bought out and be saved from the Titanic

> sinking ship disaster that EPA/ER have created in Libby, MT. EPA/ER
> continues to contaminate and devalue my property on 188 Mahoney Rd in
> Libby. Please respond with your action plan to buy my EPA/ER
> contaminated/devalued property. Enough is enough. I moved because of the
> increased health risks brought about by ER moving next door to my
> property and blowing around contaminants in the air. There has been no
> follow through from EPA/ER's promise to monitor the air quality as
> stated by Mike and Ted to residents on Mahoney Rd. I have several
> documented conversations with EPA/ER staff regarding health and safety
> issues, with no follow through on the part of EPA/ER. Please put me on
> the list for the buyout.
>
> Sincerely, Suzanne Rios
> Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry
>
>

On 6/14/10 9:25 AM, "gordon sullivan" <gordsull@yahoo.com> wrote:

Mr. Cirian,

I await a response to my question if 'YOU DENY THAT A GROUP OF
FAILED A DRUG TEST????

Thank you,

Gordon Sullivan

--- On Mon, 6/7/10, Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov <Cirian.Mike@epa

From: Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov <Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa

Subject: Re: OU-1 cleanup work

To: "DC Orr" <xcav8orr@hotmail.com>

Cc: Lensink.Andy@epamail.epa.gov, Murray.Bill@epamail.epa.gov,
catharine_ransom@baucus.senate.gov, clecours@mt.gov, filmwes
Margand.Freya@epamail.epa.gov, gordsull@yahoo.com, Dawson
Campbell-Rierson" <kirby_campbell-rierson@baucus.senate.gov>
Grandison.Lawrence@epamail.epa.gov, mvolesky@mt.gov, Thom
Earle.Sean@epamail.epa.gov, Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov, "Ter
Ketellapper.Victor@epamail.epa.gov, "Virginia Sloan" <virginia_

glena.young@cityoflibby.com

Date: Monday, June 7, 2010, 3:26 PM

Mr. Orr;

This is in response to concerns you raised regarding the City's installation of a waterline at the former Export Plant property. EPA has coordinated closely with the City Administrator, city crew and City's engineering firm to assist the City with this waterline extension project. EPA agreed to excavate two portions of the trench through suspected or known areas of contamination. The City agreed to excavate the connecting portion of the line that runs parallel to the river. The City's contractor and engineering firm would provide the installation and oversight of the waterline distribution and service connections.

Throughout the length of the project, EPA was available to provide oversight, respond to questions, or offer additional assistance for a work where the City might have encountered vermiculite or asbestos contamination. The City's contractor, who is trained and certified asbestos work, was informed of EPA's offer of assistance during a pre-construction meeting. The City's contractors did not contact EPA for assistance. EPA coordination with the City Administrator and city workers was excellent.

As you have identified, there is an area near the ramp access where suspect materials will be covered with a single lift (approximately 12 inches) of clean fill and a barrier has been placed to delineate that transition zone and all other areas were covered with 12 inches of common fill. Remediation of this area, along with the rest of the former Export Plant property, will be completed once EPA implements the remedy selected in the Record of Decision (May 2010).

I can assure you that EPA's contractor and the city crew excavating trenches did not cross contaminate the site, nor did they track vermiculite or asbestos contamination off site. When the excavation was completed, EPA turned the project over to the City and its'

engineering firm for completion of the waterline extension project

Regarding the rumors about any recent personnel actions, they are and are not true.

Sincerely,

Mike Cirian, PE
US EPA
Remedial Project Manager

;;
OU-1 cleanup work

& nbs p;

DC Orr
to:

brad, Mike Cirian, catharine_ransom, clecours, Sean Earle
filmwest, gordsull, Lawrence Grandison, Helen Dawson,
jpodolinsky, Victor Ketellapper, Kirby Campbell-Rierson
larry.anderson, Andy Lensink, Ted Linnert, Freya Margan,
Bill Murray, mvolesky, Rebecca Thomas, rodriguez-newst
suzi rios, Terry Spear , Virginia Sloan

06/07/2010 08:18 AM

Mr. Cirian;

I was able to view the work at OU-1 over the weekend and it rais

some questions.

There is obvious visible vermiculite along the entire toe of the slope in the ramp access to this site. This has been identified as a major source of contamination. It would appear that EPA is not going to remove this visible vermiculite. It has been laying there, uncovered, a public park since your contractor exposed it 8-10 weeks ago.

There are tracks from various types of machinery that have tramped right through the pockets of visible vermiculite. Some of these tracks have left a visible trail where they tracked the contaminated soil in the sand your contractors had spread over some of the excavation that is the site accessible for the contractors installing the waterline. This cross contamination has the potential to come back on the people at Libby who have expressed interest in making a playground in that area since it will be only six inches underground and ICs are being designed for at least twelve inches of cover.

Can you tell me if there were any instructions to the waterline contractors to avoid these pockets of raw vermiculite while installing the 1700 foot utility? Were there procedures in place to decontaminate the installers equipment before they moved that equipment to another location? What were those procedures? Did you document compliance?

I have heard that the inspectors who watched the City crews dig the ditch sat in a City truck with the motor running to keep warm while they were on-site and couldn't always see the activity. This does not inspire confidence that these are professionals brought in to monitor work at the site with the greatest death and disease in the history of EPA. There are also rumors that drug testing recently eliminated a large section of trained personnel from your contractors roster. Please tell me this is not true.

There is topsoil dumped in some places where it is touching this exposed vermiculite. Is it your intention to avoid a cover of commercial fill before the topsoil goes on? This would leave only a six inch cover of topsoil between the raw product and the people using this public park. Is that acceptable to EPA?

Please answer these questions before the crews go down there and uncover this up.

Sincerely, DC Orr

Hotmail has tools for the New Busy. Search, chat and e-mail from

inbox. Learn more.